

### **REMARKS**

The Official Action mailed March 13, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on November 2, 2001; November 30, 2001; April 18, 2002; September 20, 2002; May 9, 2003; January 30, 2004; June 16, 2004; March 8, 2005; June 27, 2005; August 11, 2005; October 12, 2005; and January 12, 2007.

Claims 2, 4, 6-9, 19, 21, 24-42 and 44-58 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. Claims 2, 4, 8, 37, 38 and 41 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 6, 7, 9, 19, 21, 39, 40, 42 and 44-47 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention. Claims 24-36 and 48-58 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner (Box 4a, Office Action Summary, Paper No. 20070306). Accordingly, claims 6, 7, 9, 19, 21, 39, 40, 42 and 44-47 are currently elected, of which claims 6, 7, 9, 39, 40 and 42 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 2 of the Official Action rejects claims 2, 4, 6-9, 19, 21, 37-42 and 44-47 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,051,570 to Tsujikawa, U.S. Patent No. 4,007,294 to Woods and U.S. Patent No. 4,778,258 to Parks. The Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the


prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. Independent claims 6, 7, 9, 39, 40 and 42 have been amended to recite "a thin film transistor comprising a semiconductor film including ... a gate insulating film covering the semiconductor film ...; wherein said gate insulating film contains fluorine and is in contact with a top surface and side surfaces of the semiconductor film." Also, the independent claims recite "a leveling film comprising an organic resin formed over said thin film transistor." The fluorine in the gate insulating film prevents mobile ions from the leveling film comprising the organic resin from getting into the semiconductor layer. Tsujikawa, Woods and Parks, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-referenced features of the present invention.

Since Tsujikawa, Woods and Parks do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Eric J. Robinson  
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.  
PMB 955  
21010 Southbank Street  
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165  
(571) 434-6789